

Remarks

Claims 1-17 are pending.

Claims 1-3 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Mietling (US Patent No. 6,385,322).

Mietling discloses a speaker system in which there are two separate paths; one path, for power of the speaker 7, and one path for data transmission 9. As the data transmission and the power are separated, there is no need for high impedance to be presented at the communications interface to avoid degradation of the speaker performance due to the communications power and signaling. This is not shown by Mietling. In order for the elements of a claim to be anticipated by a reference all elements of the claim must be shown.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include this limitation, claims 5 and 10 being canceled by this amendment. Therefore, Mietling does not anticipate these limitations. Further, as the high impedance is not necessary in Mietling, this limitation is also not obvious. It is therefore submitted that claims 1 and 9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 4, 5 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(e) as being unpatentable over Mietling in view of Konno et al. (US Patent No. 6,282,296).

Claim 5 has been canceled by this amendment. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and inherently includes all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claim. It is therefore submitted that claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

With regard to claim 15-17, as stated in the office action Mietling fails to disclose a high-pass filter to pass a high-frequency carrier signal, as that is not needed in Mietling because of the separate power path. The variable gain circuit of Konno does not read on the

communications module, as the variable gain circuit of Konno does not communicate between the speaker and the amplifier. Claim 15, as amended, requires that the communications module have high impedance in the frequencies in the audio range of the speaker system. As discussed above, this is not shown, taught nor suggested by the references or the combination thereof. Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 and inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 15-17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mietling in view of Erickson (US Patent No. 4,688,257).

As discussed above, Mietling does not show, teach nor suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 9, from which these claims depend. Erickson does nothing to overcome these deficiencies. These claims inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 6 and 12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mietling in view of Langston (US Patent No. 6,272,351).

As discussed above, Mietling does not show, teach nor suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 9, from which these claims depend. Langston does nothing to overcome these deficiencies. These claims inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that

claims 7 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mietling in view of Long et al. (US Patent No. 5,640,385).

As discussed above, Mietling does not show, teach nor suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 9, from which these claims depend. Long does nothing to overcome these deficiencies. These claims inherently include all of the limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach the limitations of the base claim much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 8 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

Customer No. 46404
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613